REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application is made obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103 or under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 37, 39-41, 43 AND 44 FOR OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING

The Examiner rejected claims 37, 39-41, 43 and 44 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of United States patent 6,751,417 in view of United States patent 5,521,734. In addition, claims 37, 39-41, 43 and 44 are also rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of United States patent 6,654,563 in view of United States patent 5,521,734.

Claims 37, 39-41, 43 and 44 have been canceled without prejudice. As such, the present rejection is now moot. However, Applicants reserve the rights to file one or more continuation applications to continue prosecution of these canceled claims.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 37, 39-41, 43 AND 44 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 37, 39-41, 43 and 44 in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Frigo (U.S. Patent No. 5,521,734, issued May 28, 1996) in view of Sutherland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,191,456, issued March 2, 1993)

Responsive to the Examiner, Applicants have canceled claims 37, 39-41, 43 and 44 without prejudice. The rejection is now moot. However, Applicants reserve the rights to file one or more continuation applications to continue prosecution of these canceled claims.

III. ALLOWED SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner has objected to claims 38 and 42 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Responsive to the Examiner, Applicants have amended these claims into allowable form as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request the objection be withdrawn.

IV. CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicants submit that all of these claims now fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring the issuance of a final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Kin-Wah Tong, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

2/4/05

Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,400
(732) 530-9404

Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702